

1 Michael W. Armstrong (SBN 87799)  
2 NOLAN, ARMSTRONG & BARTON, LLP  
3 600 University Avenue  
Palo Alto, CA 94301  
Tel. (650) 326-2980 Fax (650) 326-9704

EÖÉÓŐÓÀÁÉÉGÖ ÓÉ

4 Counsel for Defendant  
5 Keven Yang

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

12 UNITED STATES,

Case No. CR 11-00472 RMW

Plaintiff,

V.

16 KEVEN CHEN CHIEH YANG,

**MOTION TO CONTINUE STATUS  
HEARING DATE**

Date: December 10, 2012

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Court: The Hon. Ronald M. Whyte

17 || Defendant.

Defendant, Keven Yang, through his counsel, Michael W. Armstrong, of Nolan, Armstrong & Barton, LLP, hereby moves the court for a continuance of the status hearing presently scheduled for Monday, December 10, 2012, at 9:00 a.m. before the Honorable Ronald M. Whyte.

The reason for this motion is that on approximately October 17, 2012, Judge Grewal approved the issuance of a subpoena duces tecum to the law firm of Fenwick & West. The records sought by defendant include documents and communications between Fenwick & West and their then-client, Mr. Calvin Yu, and his father who are the alleged victims of the crimes charged against Mr. Yang in the present indictment. Fenwick & West advised Mr. Yu and his father about

1 entering into various business dealings with Mr. Yang in approximately 2006 through 2008, some  
2 of which dealings are the subject of the present indictment.

3       In the discovery already received from the government in this case are included emails  
4 from Fenwick & West to Mr. Yu, some of which are then forwarded on to Mr. Yang. The  
5 communications among these parties and the advice and knowledge passed on to Mr. Yu from his  
6 then-attorneys at Fenwick & West are important facts for the determination of issues raised by this  
7 indictment.

8       The subpoena duces tecum was served on Fenwick & West on November 1, 2012, and  
9 since that date, defendant's counsel, Michael W. Armstrong, has been in contact with lawyers at  
10 Fenwick & West about the production of these documents. Fenwick & West has indicated that  
11 they have issues with both the scope of the subpoena in terms of the records sought, as well as  
12 possible privilege issues, since they were not representing Mr. Yu in the subsequent civil suit  
13 brought by him against Mr. Yang which was litigated in the California State Court. The issues  
14 raised by Fenwick & West, both as to the scope of the subpoena and the privilege issues, are  
15 complex and need more time to be sorted out between counsel for Mr. Yang and Fenwick & West.

16       I have advised counsel for the government, Amber Rosen, of the situation, and even  
17 forwarded on to her a written reply that I received from Fenwick & West as to their concerns  
18 about the subpoena. Ms. Rosen has indicated to Mr. Armstrong that she has no objection to this  
19 request for a continuance of the status hearing, but wanted Mr. Armstrong to put this information  
20 in writing before the court in the form of a motion so that the court and counsel would have further  
21 written understanding of the issues raised by the issuance of the subpoena duces tecum in this  
22 case.

23       ///

24       ///

25       ///

26       ///

27       ///

28

1 For these reasons, counsel for defendant moves the court for a continuance of the status  
2 hearing from December 10, 2012 to Hgdtwct{ "6, 2013.

3 Respectfully submitted,

4 NOLAN, ARMSTRONG & BARTON

5  
6 Dated: December 7, 2012

7 \_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
8 MICHAEL W. ARMSTRONG  
9 Attorney for Defendant KEVIN YANG

10  
11 Dated: December 7, 2012

12 \_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
13 AMBER ROSEN  
14 Assistant United States Attorney

15 **ORDER**

16  
17 For the foregoing reasons, the Court grants the motion to continue status hearing and  
18 continues the next status conference in this case from December 10, 2012 to Hgdtwct{ "6."4013 at  
19 9:00 a.m. For the reasons stated above, the Court further finds that the ends of justice served by  
20 granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a  
21 speedy trial. See U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(8)(7)(iv). Accordingly, time shall be  
22 excluded from December 10, 2012 through Hgdtwct{ "6, 2013.

23 SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: December 1, 2012

25   
26 THE HONORABLE RONALD M. WHYTE